MACARTHUR'S SNOWBALL

Who says old dogs can't learn new tricks?

"We should now proclaim our readiness to abolish war in concert with the other great powers of the world."

This call for world peace was not made by a peace organization. It was made by a famous general, MacArthur, a man known hitherto for his war-making, if not war-mongering, activities. It reflects, even now, nothing more than the cold hard logic of the realistic soldier. It is based squarely on the will to survive.

In this statement MacArthur differs from the professionals in the Pentagon who proceed upon a demolished premise. They act as if they were living in the days of Lord Palmerston or Admiral Dewey. MacArthur has learned at first hand, from his Yalu experience, the true nature of Chinese resistance. And he has seen with his own eyes the effect of primitive atomic weapons upon Japanese cities. He can deduce the effect of the later far more deadly bombs on American cities. He lives at the center of the largest of these cities, in the tower of the Waldorf Hotel. MacArthur has been a pro-consul with a proud country at his feet. He has a yen for politics, would like to be President of his own country. He loves to express himself in grandiose phraseology, yet with it manages to retain a certain individual style. He may have a quite legitimate ambition to leave behind him a reputation comparable to that of George Washington or Abraham Lincoln, each of whom preserved his country as well through the arts of peace as of war.

At any rate he has made a snowball for peace which, if kept rolling, could grow into an avalanche and bury once for all the insane dream of those who would push the boundaries of the USA into China waters or even, as was suggested by the president of Union Theological Seminary, as far as the Western boundaries of China.

It is this kind of criminal lust for power which MacArthur, who, God must be thankful, leaves Him out of the argument, crushes to a fine powder and blows away. Without sentiment, without even an appeal to conscience, he blows it away.

"It is no longer an ethical question... but a hardcore one for decision by the masses whose survival is the issue... The leaders are the laggards."

The Legionaires to whom the General addressed these words must have blinked their eyes. Who was this talking about the masses? Was this the wealthy patrician spit-in-your-eye MacArthur speaking for "the ordinary people of the world"? It was, and he was basing his whole argument on something these ordinary people had discovered, namely the complete futility of mass-destructive war. And it is because it is MacArthur saying this, the representative par excellence of the class which hates the rise of socialist power, that it is so important. Here is no foreign radical, no outcast, no heretic. Here is big business in person, top brass in person, and an American hero to boot! Saying quite plainly that war is not worth waging because it cannot be won.

The thought of course is not new. Half the world has been hammering at it for a long time. Moreover, nothing will come of this unless the masses, in behalf of whose common sense MacArthur spoke, pick up his statement and make a popular movement out of it. Several suggestions have been made already for getting this thing underway.

We hope that out of these efforts a tide of letters will pour across President Eisenhower's desk bringing MacArthur's statement down to the brass tacks of the Formosa situation, calling for NO WAR IN THE FAR EAST and for the recall of American forces from Chinese territory and from Chinese territorial waters.

Conscience and Survival:

It is remarkable that MacArthur did not use "religion" or "ethics" to bolster up his argument for peace. Capitalism (and MacArthur could never be mistaken for anything but a capitalist) has no religion and no ethics, unless one may call the instinct for survival a religion and dog-eat-dog an ethic. But it keeps a large inventory of papier maché imitations of these commodities with their purveyors and puppeteers (Billy Grahams, Bishop Sheens, Norman Vincent Peales) always in readiness to dish out these fake religions, whenever, either anticipating or during a depression, it needs to divert the anger of the masses, or whenever it needs a war to haul itself out of a depression. All the more unusual then that MacArthur, closely connected to the great banking house of Morgan, should come off all that folderol and remember the common people and talk plainly to them.

It reminds one remotely of the days when the bankers came hat in hand to F.D.R. and asked that rememberer of the common man to help them in their very real troubles. F.D.R. gave them not "religion" but pump-priming, inflation of buying power among the people, and, finally, war. That war, of the capitalist nations against two of their number gone berserk, was so conducted as to harden and strengthen socialist power until today it confronts capitalist power on a plane of equality.

The wily Churchill, betraying the Greeks, betraying the Italians, postponing the attack on Germany until Russia should have been bled white, stashing arms for the Nazis to use against the hated socialist power, talking about Europe's 'soft under-belly', must be flabbergasted to contemplate now the end result of his cleverness. For these betrayals simply added new confirmation to previous Russian experience of capitalist encirclement and drove home to the Russians the necessity of consolidating socialist power.

It is this consolidation, or, to put it plainly, it is socialist strength, not the H-Bomb in itself, which is the new element in the situation. Of course the H-Bomb is an earth shaking weapon and to fool around with it in any event is suicidal.

Nevertheless, we cannot honestly think that the USA, which initiated atomic warfare against civilian populations on this earth, would hesitate to use H-Bombs, provide it was a sure thing that the socialist nations did not possess them.

No, the fresh element in the historic picture is the paradox of of peace arriving with power and yet retaining its character as peace, of the dove accompanied by the serpent yet not inside the serpent, of Christ with Caesar but remaining Christ. For Thine is the Kingdom and the Power and the Glory. The rabbinic prayer has been answered!

The Logic of Survival:

The logic of capitalism, when the wish-dreams of fear-ridden churchmen, power-drunk admirals, and illusion-swollen statesmen, have been subtracted is simply to survive as long as possible in a world it cannot win but may hold at arm's length for a period of time. This is what underlies MacArthur's plea.

If the present administration in the USA is not committed to war on behalf of Chiang Kai-shek then it must withdraw from Formosa and Chinese waters and at most furnish a place of refuge for Chiang, perhaps on some more distant and smaller island. If, on the other hand, the administration feels that it is committed and in honour bound to go to war to prevent China from occupying her own territory, restored to her on the word of President Roosevelt at Cairo, then it must be replaced. That is the logic of the situation. The USA must reverse her policy towards China.

Reversal in Progress:

Such a reversal is not so tall an order as it may seem. A face-saving formula can always be found when a great power decides to backtrack a little. The chief obstacle is the junior partner, Chiang, who has believed the promises of the wish-dreamers. Formosa is no plum for him. He wants China back on a platter, made in USA. He wants the works. He must be pacified or at all events silenced, because, knowing where the bodies are buried he holds the power of blackmail. Yet, even now, as we write, his soldiers are being escorted backward out of some of the off-shore islands which, he has been assured at least unofficially were to be jumping-off places for the invasion of China. This involved quite a wrangle, high words, slammed doors; but who in the world cares, except those immediately concerned.

The reversal, now begun, which must be completed, would never have been necessary had not Truman allowed the State Department and the Navy to put one over on him during the Korean crisis when the USA, sleep-walking in a dream of grandeur, unilaterally and without a shred of legality, moved into Chinese territorial waters.

It was done under the pretext of protecting China from Chiang as well as Formosa from Mao. The pretext was thin ehough and soon wore through. Under American protection and with American help Chiang has been a thorn in China's flesh, preying on peaceful shipping, lobbying shells and dropping parachutists onto the mainland from the offshore islands, conducting espionage and sabotage.

Now talk about losing face! Who was losing face during this protracted period? What other great power would have stood for such treatment for so long? But the limit has been reached. The bitter fruit of this American exacerbation of China is ripe, more than ripe. There is no justification, there never has been any, for standing in front of China and giving her short jabs in the face, preparing for a knock-out blow, all in the name of defense of the free world. It makes one blush to see intelligent men like Walter Lippmann compelled to rationalize such brigandage.

The only possible excuse for the occupation by the USA of islands and peninsulas belonging to or close to China is the presumption that China intends to make war on the USA. Since China has been not the perpetrator but the victim of all the aggression in her neighborhood for the past hundred and more years it is impossible to justify such a presumption. To hear Eisenhower and Dulles talk you would think it was China that was occupying Cuba or the Santa Barbara Islands along with the half of Lower California, instead of the other way around!

Moreover this occupation presupposes the validity of war itself, even naked aggressive imperialist war. And, as MacArthur says, and as everyone knows, war is not valid any more. It is invalid, kaput, washed up forever as an instrument of policy between the nations. So this occupation, which no one has even tried to excuse from a moral point of view and whose premise and promise is war, is not valid and must be abandoned.

From Imperative to Indicative:

The prayers and the demands, the vocatives and the imperatives, of religions may all be expressed in the indicative mood.

There is no need to say that God orders us to obey certain laws. It is more persuasive, more terribly compelling to say calmly that things are arranged in such a way that while certain actions fulfill themselves certain other actions defeat themselves.

There is no need to pray to God to forgive us for this or that. It is better expressed by simply saying that we <u>are</u> forgiven our trespasses exactly in the degree and with the understanding with which we forgive those who trespass against us.

The new Christian finds his God not on a throne but in the constitution of the world he discovers as a scientist and makes as an artist. The scientists who discovered the H-Bomb have revealed the direction in which war was always moving down through the centuries from the club and stone of pre-historic man to this happy day, when it is seen to be self-defeating.

The creators in the art of politics are now compelled to find new methods for the reconciliation and accomodation of national differences and rivalries.

In spite of the shadow which has been cast over the reputation of Stalin, we believe he will be remembered as the great architect of that peace the world will soon be reaping, the first real peace it will ever have known.

MacArthur's appeal is both cynical and sincere. For the status quo will obviously have something to gain from a general pacification, namely a lease on life, brief though it be. For a time there may well be a kind of political peace which can be used in certain countries against the people. There is this sort of peace now in Portugal, in Spain, South Korea, in Guatemala and elsewhere. It is the peace of ignorance, of horror, of death, of indignity. A peace of co-existence may well involve the sacrifice by the people of these lands for some time to come of the hope of liberation. Yet the order is adamant.

And in the long run world peace with its consequent plenty, with its release of new energies, will erode the tyrannies and finally rub them out. The war makers will have to find new jobs. Peace will wear down and chase ignorance away as people travel from land to land and see things for themselves.

The new Christian will appear and the new Buddhist and the new Jew. And they will embrace as brothers rooted in the same reality, singing in differing accents one song. And the human family in all its rich variety will be One.

This will come about not because of the H-Bomb. It will come about because of socialist power and socialist realism as some call it. We call it humility.

+ + + + + + + + +

LIFE FAVOURS SUICIDE...

Life (Feb. 7/55) editorializes, correctly, with respect to the MacArthur address, that there is nothing new in it. The novelty for them was in how and when he said what he did. "...to a country trying to summon the resolution to fight, it is strange service to be told that fighting settles nothing. Sometimes —and this is such a time— willingness to fight is the only chance at peace we have."

But is it not one thing to be willing to fight in defense of your own home and quite another to summon resolution to fight for a piece of another man's home 6000 miles away? Listen to this confused editor: (1) ...in the next few years "there is no conceivable US foreign policy that does not entail some risk of atomic war."

(2) "The present atomic stalemate...contains the only safeguards against it mankind has."

(3) "To make this (war's abolition) on human terms is why Communism must be resisted and disarmed." A tall order, involving all-out war. This must be what Life favours: world suicide.

In the course of this editorial Life candidly admits what we have claimed from the first, that the Baruch Plan was a trap.

"...the enforced peace of an atomic monopoly...was the goal of the old Baruch Plan."

This is the trap the Russians have been so scolded for evading.

+ + + + + + + + +

By Louise Harding

Eisenhower has most peculiar notions regarding a peace policy. Chiang, driven off the mainland by the Chinese people, was forcibly installed on Taiwan (Formosa) which is conceded to belong to China. This was against the wishes of the inhabitants of the island, and was accomplished by their wholesale massacre. He has been kept in power by U.S. arms, and maintains his regime only by ruthless dictatorship.

The admirer of colonialism, H. Maclear Bate, wrote in his "Report from Formosa", 1952, p. 24: "All through my stay on the island I was haunted by the shadow of a police state malevolent in its objectives and farreaching in its methods."

The People's Republic of China was termed, by U.S. reaction, a tyranny existing against popular desire; and Chiang's brutal dictatorship was called by U.S., the "republic" of China. Names, however, change no facts, and writers who are honest though conservative, admit the great improvement in the lot of the Chinese people under the new regime.

Now, Eisenhower tells China that, if she wants peace, she must consent to the permanent occupation of Formosa by this enemy of progress and liberty, who formerly bled China white, and constantly plots to regain dictatorial power on the mainland under the aegis of U.S.A.

The powers asked by Eisenhower are broad enough, admits Dulles, to enable attack on the mainland if the U.S. President thinks that necessary to protect Chiang.

But by radio the people of U.S. are soothed by tales that such assaults probably would not bring Russia into conflict - this they maintain in spite of the fact that she is bound by treaty to enter such a war. Thus, MacArthur, in truth wishing a general war, nevertheless asserted that China would not resent the march to the Yalu, although China - as he well knew - had officially stated the contrary.

In the present most-hazardous situation, British "officials", we are told, applaud Eisenhower's stand, and call it one of peace. Words can say Black is White, but they cannot avert destruction from the British isles - and very possibly the rest of the world - if War follows this lying "peace" policy of U.S.A. reactionaries.

And, in the "next war", which individuals like Knowland, Radford, and Montgomery have been so blithely alluding to, it is certain that millions now ruled by Monopoly Capitalism, will learn what atomic slaughter really means.

Looking at the Eisenhower Message, your scribe offers amendments and corrections as follows, to wit:

"Our security" is seriously imperiled by the Formosan Straits situation: —What threatens is the spectre of Atomic War.

"Our loyal ally", Chiang: —change that to "stooge".

"The island chain of the Western Pacific" builds security for U.S. and other "free" nations: Well, if it makes U.S.A. "secure" to plant its rocket stations and bombs 200 miles off the Chinese coast, on Formosa (and it is even contemplated to hold Quemoy, three miles from the Chinese coast), what about Chinese security?

"The Communist mainland" says Eisenhower, referring throughout to the political and social beliefs which he ascribes to China. This shows what the oncoming war really will be fought for. It is the struggle of Monopoly Capitalism against social change.

The "provocative" purpose of China is the "conquest" of Formosa: False - China wishes to retake Formosa: quite another thing.

Eisenhower wants "United" Nations to achieve a cease fire: inasmuch as the overwhelming majority of that organization is united against Com-

munism, no Communist regime can have confidence in it. In the early days of the war on Korea, how did UN conduct itself? To remember that is all that is necessary in this emergency.

"....the unified and serious intentions of our Government, our Congress and our people." That "our" refers to the great corporations of U.S.A. As to the people of U.S., Nixon said they are "uninformed", and nix on regarding what they want.

"Our purpose is peace": To flout the wishes and rights of the great Chinese people, and threaten action which will bring Russia in, is, as aforesaid, a most peculiar way to woo the dove of peace. "In vain, in sight of any bird, the net is spread"!

San Francisco Chronicle says, "Knowland Backs Ike Declaration on Aisa Crisis." ---Change that "Backs" to "Back of".

Dulles tells newsmen: "If the resolution (to give Eisenhower discretion as to measures to be taken in "defense" of Formosa) is passed it will decrease the risk of general war in the area. If it is not passed, it will increase the risk of war."

By this time, it is pretty well known how Cartelist Dulles "decreased" the risk of war in Korea.

Walter F. George (Dem.) of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declares the Formosa problem is not one of geography, so much as one of psychology, (UP and N.Y. Times): "The Communists," he said, "are challenging the position of the United States, and the free nations of the area are watching to see what the reaction of the United States will be."

In other words, "FACE"! To arms, to arms, ye brave - to save the "face" of Monopoly Capital.

Eisenhower maintained it is necessary to "preserve the vital stake of the free world in a free Formosa and to engage in whatever operations may be required to carry out that purpose."

U.S.A. is NOT a free country, and Formosa is a darn lot less free. To speak of freedom in Formosa is nothing short of audacious, and presumes a stupid and ignorant populace.

Along with a truly provocative cartoon, San Francisco Chronicle says that "Ever since Chiang Kai-shek's flight from the mainland the United States has held to the position that Formosa was not merely Nationalist China's home and refuge, but also necessary to the strategic security of the United States in the Western Pacific.....If this kind of extended line of American interest seems frightening you had better get used to it, because the doctrine applies equally to the 13 countries of NATO". (Italics added)

One such war will be enough: it will not be necessary to "get used to them!

The Chronicle observes that it, and Eisenhower, believe that the American president would have "the power to act in the interest of the United States without first getting congressional authority, as former President Truman did in Korea."

Truman got away with his illegal action, so why can't General Ike? This shows what comes of the supine yielding of Constitutional rights. Kick out part of the foundation, and soon the whole edifice comes crashing down.

The "Broken-Backed War":

Says the arch-reactionary Governor of California, Goodwin J. Knight, "We must be willing and ready to pick ourselves up off the ground....and be in position to deliver counter blows in the event of another Pearl Harbor."

Get up off the ground - IF ANY, after an atomic war! And does Knight mean to imply that U.S. provoked Pearl Harbour? Sounds like it, under the circumstances, one would say.

The Goebbels Lament:

As to Stamina, the Nazis used to proclaim that Germany had the mon-

opoly. But finally said Goebbels (May 6, 1942), "If we had to do with a civilized people in our eastern campaign, it would long ago have collapsed, but the Russians are quite unpredictable in this and other matters. They have a capacity for suffering that is simply impossible with other peoples."

Very unfortunate for Goebbels and his gang. They figured wrong.

A radio report says that Pravda advises that if U.S. truly wants peace, it will withdraw its fleet from Formosa Straits. This disposes of U.S. reactionaries who have tried to make us believe Russia will not come into the conflict if the Chinese mainland is fired upon.

Inasmuch as Eisenhower claims (falsely) that the whole U.S. population is behind him in his stand tending to war, your scribe here expresses the opinion that a great power such as present China, cannot possibly tolerate an enemy established by a foreign power on territory as close to China as is Taiwan - with its continued preying on its legitimate trade and destruction of its shipping. China is no longer the land that fell victim to the Opium War.

Trade with China:

Manchester Guardian - which has become conservative in the main - nevertheless (Dec. 30, 1954) publishes an important article on China by Ernest Thornton, M.P.

Prices are stable, or nearly so, he says, and the morale of the people obviously improved. "Eight years ago.....widespread corruption and graft in places high and low in governmental and public spheres were accepted and admitted." And, "in this atmosphere.....production was stagnating."

The Kuomintang government had elaborate blueprints for public improvements, writes Mr. Thornton, but they never got off the drawing-boards!

"The most striking difference between the new and the old regime is perhaps the fulfilment of promises and plans. So far as I could observe, many of the plans on the drawing-boards of the Kuomintang (and many other schemes besides) have quickly taken practical form. ....The almost derelict railway system of China has been completely rehabilitated. Trains run to time. Great lengths of new tracks are under construction and moving to plan."

This traveler thinks that perhaps the most impressive changes have been made in Manchuria; made with the help of Russian experts and technicians. "Throughout South Manchuria there are clear signs of complete rehabilitation and impressive new industrial building."

It may be, he thinks, speaking as a Britisher, that "we have missed the boat: 75% of (China's) external trade is with the Soviet Union and the Iron Curtain countries. China's production, we were told (and I believe it), has easily reached an all-time record. This rehabilitation and expansion, perhaps one of the most spectacular the world has seen, has been achieved under conditions of trade embargoes by the Western World - without the participation of British, American, or German capital or 'know-how'. ....I am left with the thought that this successful effort towards industrialisation of China, in the face of Western hostility, will have greater political repercussions on the rest of Asia than any Communist subversive activities."

Very Strange Phenomena:

London, Jan. 16, gets "its worst fog". "We have never seen such intensity before," said the weatherman at the Air Ministry. "It is quite fantastic. It frightened the wits out of some people." A blizzard with winds up to eighty miles an hour, hit Japan on the same day. Fourteen fishermen were reported missing off the coast of Kyusha. On the 17th, a strong earthquake shook Tokyo; and widespread floods, storms at sea and blizzards killed twelve persons. A great storm, with hurricane winds and heavy rains, struck the Pacific coast of the United States; hail fell, and power lines were down.

The theory is advanced, on eminent authority, that the great Hydrogen and Atomic blasts, creating their own wind currents, hurl particles of sand high into the air, where ice accumulates around them and, melting later on,

causes torrents of rain. This could account for the unprecedented avalanches in Europe in recent years.

Contemporary Issues, published in N.Y., says in its leaflet, "Stop the Bomb", that Lewis L. Strauss "conveniently....forgets to tell us that although another fishing vessel (than the Fortunate Dragon) was 780 miles away from the blast site, it registered Geiger count readings described as 'above the danger point' by an AP dispatch of March 27th. As if to anticipate this fact, the worthy Admiral hints at a possible change in wind directions. Could it be that the bomb creates its own atmospheric conditions, rendering weather and fallout predictions nearly meaningless? The N.Y. Times prints a report from one American observer of the explosion to the effect that the bomb 'set off a local wind storm that might have upset weather forecasts that had been correct earlier,' and a Marine corporal (on Kwajalein) writes that the explosion 'was followed by a very high wind.' .....Strauss does not tell us that the increase in radiation reached as far eastward as New York City, and that the Japanese fishermen on the Fortunate Dragon were exposed to radioactive strontium isotopes which have a half-life of twenty-five years. Will these isotopes, Mr. Commissioner, 'decrease rapidly after the tests'? Or have they been scattered throughout the world by air and ocean currents? How, amidst all these qualifications, contradictions and shrewd omissions, can we trust you to tell us the truth?

".....An International News Service science writer reports: 'Evidence that Japanese survivors of the first atomic bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki may develop deadly cancer in their old age was disclosed by a top cancer specialist. Similar effects, the scientist indicated, conceivably could appear in the future in the Japanese fishermen recently showered with ashes from this month's (March 1954) hydrogen bomb explosion.' (The scientist referred to, Dr. Jacob Furth of the Children's Cancer Research Center in Boston, examined 6,000 mice exposed to the Bikini blast, and found that they 'developed tremendous tumors of the pituary gland in their old age.') The report continued that the 'mouse studies already have found a grim parallel in some of the biological changes occurring in surviving men and women at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The mice developed cancer of the blood (leukemia) - and Dr. Furth said some reports show the incidence of leukemia in the two Japanese cities has been seven times normal since the bomb was dropped.'"

On March 30, 1954, the (London) Times published a letter from the leading cancer research specialist in Britain, Dr. Alexander Haddow, referring to the increase of leukemia in a proportion of the survivors of the Hiroshima explosion; he said, "If we are entering the realm of the incalculable so far as individual test explosions are concerned, the likelihood of ultimate disaster grows steadily greater."

Your reporter sent copies of the Haddow letter to several San Francisco newspapers - they did not publish it.

Denver, Nov. 18, 1954 - An American Cancer Society official has warned that malignancies will eventually strike one-fourth of the American people, if the present incidence rate continues unchecked.

And Leonard V. Griffith, national director of field services for the society, said "some 40 million Americans now alive will develop cancer. If more is not done to bring the death rate down, some 24 million of them will die of cancer."

January 6, an item from Tokyo (Reuters) mentioned that the Japanese fishermen injured in the Bikini test, had been returned to the hospital after spending Christmas with their families. (One had already died. In the Chronicle, the item is callously headed, "Hot Fishermen".)

Here is another item (San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 10):

"Hiroshima, Jan. 9, AP - Doctors are checking for any possible connection between the 1945 atomic bombing of Hiroshima and the mysterious death last week of a Japanese boy.

"Mitsuharu Mitrani, 9, born a short time after the world's first atomic bombing, and his mother both had appeared in good health until last

month.

"Mitsuharu then became seriously ill. Thursday night he died after severely bleeding from burst blood vessels in his eyes, mouth, nose and ears.

"In 1945, his mother, Fujike Mitani, then 31 and pregnant, was about seven miles from the center of the Hiroshima blast. She has suffered no apparent ill effects from the blast and probable exposure to radiation."

SF Chronicle had a dispatch from N.Y. Times quoting Dr. A. H. Sturtevant, professor of genetics in the California Institute of Technology,as saying (Jan.11) that "contentions (which have been advanced by the Atomic Energy Commission) that the tests were harmless were 'inexcusable', and urged intensive study of the implications of the work. 'From a humanitarian point of view, any increase at all in the number of individuals that are defective either mentally or physically is not lightly to be dimissed,' he said." He also stated that the unfavourable mutations might be as much as 100 times as great as calculated.

In a letter to Dr. R.R.Sackley of Chicago, Chingo Shibata, of Suginami, Tokyo, writes:

"According to the report by doctors in Nagasaki, of 50,150 innocent children who were born in Nagasaki since the explosion of the A-bomb, 4,282 were abnormal; 371 were still-born and the abortion of 181 had to be caused. Of 3,630 abnormal children, 1,046 had deformed frame, muscles, skin or nervous system; 426 had deformed organs of smell or hearing; 245 had deformed lips or tongue, 243 had deformed internal organs. Also, 47 had deformed brains; 25 were without brains; 8 were without eyes or eye-sockets."

Falling in, however, with the claim of AEC, Kurt Stern, University of California geneticist, makes the contention that Dr. Albert Schweitzer exaggerates the danger to future generations from the radio-active fall-out from H-bomb tests. (SF News, Dec.3, 1954). In a guest editorial published in the journal Science, Dr. Stern writes: "In terms of mankind as a whole, the biological consequences of controlled test explosions are very small."

Imagine the murderer of one person (with the crime committed perhaps in he heat of passion and therefore not so bad as Hiroshima or the March 1st. test) pleading that the 'biological consequences' of his act were infinitesimal!

As to the 'control' of the test explosion, "Stop the Bomb" says, justly, "The lunatics who are devising the bomb haven't the faintest idea of its power and effects! They have miscalculated on the hydrogen bomb everywhere along the way. In flat contradiction to what Strauss had to say, Representative Chet. Holifield (who witnessed the March 1st explosion and apparently is familiar with the facts) speaks of it as 'so far beyond what was predicted that you might say it was out of control.' This statement was even confirmed by President Eisenhower before the suave admiral arrived from the Pacific to obscure the dangers involved. The British Manchester Guardian.....expressed 'doubts' as to whether any further experiments in the Pacific should be continued. According to a Reuter's Dispatch: 'It said flatly that this time American scientists would be moving into the realm of the unknown'"

= = = = = = = = = = =

PLEASE SEND IN YOUR RENEWALS AND WHATEVER YOU CAN TO HELP ALONG THE WORK.

ONE

FEBRUARY 1955

EDITOR
Kenneth Leslie

ASSOCIATE EDITOR
Rev. John Tunnicliffe

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

Archbishop Adam
Rev. William T. Baird
Rev. Russell C. Barbour
Rev. Reginald H. Bass
Rev. C. Harrison Becker
Bishop Albert Bereczky
Henrietta Buckmaster
Rev. R. Alex Cameron
Rev. Boise Dent
Bishop Laszlo Dezsery
Rev. I Jonathan Domas
Rev. H. deM. DuBois
Rev. Merlin W. Ennis
Rev. Stanley Evans
Rev. John Fekete
Rev. Joseph F. Fletcher
Rev. Erwin A. Gaede
Rev. Sidney E. Harris
Rev. A. Eustace Haydon
Rev. Daniel Hughes
Rev. Hewlett Johnson
Rev. Imre Kadar
Rev. J. Spencer, Jr.
Rev. Ferenc H. Kiss
John A. Lee
David Lord
Rev. E. D. McGowan
Prof. John Macmurray
Rev. John A. Maynard
Rev. Laszlo Michnay
Rev. Joseph G. Moore
Rev. J. Murdock Palmer
Bishop John Peter
Ida Pruit
Leslie Roberts
Rev. R. Ross-Shannon
Watson Thomson
Bishop Lajos Veto
Rev. Wilfred Wakefield
Rev. Etienne Watts
Prof. Henry N. Wieman
Rev. Claude Williams
Rev. Mercer Wilson

ONE is published monthly by New Christian Books, 95 Argyle Street, Halifax, Nova Scotia. By subscription only. 12 issues $3.25. Checks and money orders payable to **New Christian Books. No agents.**

ONE

The discovery of super-power, with its promise of plenty and its threat of annihilation, forces mankind to choose now between becoming nothing or becoming **one.**

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

February, 1955 Edited by Kenneth Leslie

A NOTE OF HOPE

MACARTHUR'S SNOWBALL

LIFE'S EDITOR FAVOURS DEATH

THE MEANING OF THE NEWS

By Louise Harding

Vol. XI, No. 4 30 cents